

REMARKS

Claims 26 and 33 are amended. Claims 26-30, 32-37 and 48-58 are in the application for consideration.

The specification is amended to correct a typographical error. Entry of the same is requested.

Independent claims 26 and 33 are amended in a manner which does not go to patentability, nor do such amendments in any way change the scope of the claims as originally presented. Specifically, each claim has been amended to recite that the insulative layer comprises at least a single well which is formed therein, and that a plurality of memory cell storage capacitors are received within said single well. Accordingly, such claims recite, as they always essentially did, that one or more wells might be formed in the claim recited insulative layer. Regardless, a plurality of memory cell storage capacitors must be received within a single of any such well or wells. The stated well is recited in the claims to peripherally define an outline of a memory array area. The Examiner erroneously asserts that the alleged "wells" 8 of Fig. 4 of Jeng et al. are the equivalent of Applicant's claim recited well. The Examiner is mistaken. Applicant's claim recited well peripherally defines an outline of a memory array area and must contain a plurality of memory cell storage capacitors within a single well. Clearly, only a single capacitor is received within openings 8 of Jeng et al. Accordingly, such are not the equivalent of Applicant's claim recited well having a plurality of memory cell storage capacitors received within a single well.

Further, a combination or collection of the variously indicated openings 8 within Jeng et al. cannot be considered as a "big opening" for the same reasons which Applicant argued in its Office Action Response filed on March 7, 2003.

For at least the reason that Jeng et al. does not disclose forming a plurality of memory cell storage capacitors within Applicant's claim recited single well, the anticipation rejection of Applicant's claim 26 must be withdrawn, as Applicant recites something which Jeng et al. does not teach or disclose.

Independent claim 33 stands rejected as being unpatentable over a combination of Jeng et al. in view of Hieda et al. Independent claim 33 includes the same limitation argued above with respect to independent claim 26. Therefore, Jeng et al. is inapplicable to claim 33 for the reasons argued above. Likewise, Hieda et al. does not cure this deficiency of Jeng et al. and, accordingly, does not teach or suggest Applicant's claim recited limitation of a plurality of memory cell storage capacitors received within a single well. As neither reference discloses this attribute of Applicant's claim 33, the combination does not meet all of the limitations of Applicant's independent claim 33. Accordingly, claim 33 should be allowed, and action to that end is requested.

Applicant's dependent claims should be allowed as depending from allowable base claims, and for their own recited features which are neither shown nor suggested in the cited art. Action to that end is requested.

The undersigned appreciates the Examiner's indicated allowability of claims 54, 55, 57 and 58. Such have not been re-written in independent form due to the allowability of the independent claims from which such claims depend, and as well as the amended versions of such independent claims being of the same scope as last presented.

This application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance, and action to that end is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 3-29-04

By: 

Mark S. Matkin
Reg. No. 32,268